

**REMARKS**

After entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 3-5 and 17-42 are pending in the application.

The allowance of claims 1, 3-5 and 32-41 is noted with appreciation.

Claims 17-31 are rejected over Weiss (7,065,559) in view of Herz (6,460,036). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office notes that Weiss does not teach anticipatorily sending address information associated with foreseen payloads. Herz is cited as showing such feature.

As stated in the Action, Herz teaches a cache management system that stores files regularly requested by the remote unit. This allows them to be served more quickly when re-requested.

This is different than applicants' preferred embodiment. In applicants' preferred embodiment, the file (e.g., the address information) has not been "regularly requested." Rather, applicant's embodiment sends the address information on the speculation that it might be useful. There is no history of requests, as in Herz.

Applicants have amended independent claims 17, 23, 24, and 30 to emphasize this distinction. In particular, these claims now make clear that the second address information that is sent in anticipation of object payloads that might be forthcoming, are payloads that the hardware sensing device has not previously sensed.

An artisan considering Herz and Weiss may be led to cache frequently requested data, but there is no suggestion of caching information corresponding to payloads that have not previously been sensed.

Claim 23 is additionally amended so that its method is defined in terms of the hardware sensor device and the first device alone. Information is sent to the second device, and information is received from the second device, but the claims now define such acts from the perspective of the first device.

Claim 42 is newly presented, and is reciprocally directed to a method defined by acts performed by the second device. (The first device is mentioned to provide context, but is not performing any act of the method.) Again, claim 42 includes language distinguishing Herz (i.e., that the second address information is associated with a second physical object for which no object payload data has previously been received by the second device from the first device).

For brevity's sake, these remarks have only addressed certain of the claims, have addressed only certain aspects of the Action, and have detailed only certain of the distinctions between the claims and the art. However, such discussion is believed sufficient to establish the allowability of all pending claims. Thus, applicant does not further belabor this paper with other arguments concerning the rejections, the art, and the claims – all of which are reserved for possible presentation to the Board.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, we respectfully request a Notice of Allowance. In the meantime, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 503-469-4621 with any questions.

Date: June 25, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

**CUSTOMER NUMBER 23735**

DIGIMARC CORPORATION

Phone: 503-469-4800  
FAX 503-469-4777

By /William Y Conwell/  
William Y. Conwell  
Registration No. 31,943